

REMARKS

Claims 1-47 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-47 UNDER 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 1-47 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) based on *Woodgate et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. *Woodgate et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Claims 1 and 24 define an autostereoscopic display that includes, *inter alia*, a *transflective* spatial light modulator. The *transflective* spatial light modulator is pixellated to include at least one first region, at least one second region, and a plurality of pixels. An arrangement substantially prevents transmission of light through the at least one first region of the *transflective* spatial light modulator to an autostereoscopic viewing region of the display. A controller sets at least some of the pixels of the first region and at least some of the pixels for the second region of the *transflective* modulator to respective first and second transmissivities.

As is discussed in the present application, applicants' invention addresses the problems associated with crosstalk in a *transflective* type autostereoscopic display. In particular, the present invention describes a control mechanism by which the relative intensities between reflective and transmissive portions of the *transflective* type autostereoscopic display can be controlled in order to improve autostereoscopic performance and reduce crosstalk.

Woodgate et al., on the other hand, is directed to a *transmissive* type autostereoscopic display. Of course, a *transmissive* type autostereoscopic display is different from a *transflective* type autostereoscopic display as is readily appreciated by those having ordinary skill in the art.

More directly, *Woodgate et al.* does *not* teach or suggest the autostereoscopic display including a *transflective* spatial light modulator as recited in claims 1 and 24. Nor does *Woodgate et al.* teach or suggest the control of a *transflective* spatial light modulator as recited in claims 1 and 24. Furthermore, *Woodgate et al.* does *not* teach or suggest the advantages associated with a *transflective* type autostereoscopic display in accordance with the present invention.

For at least the above reasons, *Woodgate et al.* does not anticipate nor render obvious the invention as claimed. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 24 and the claims dependent therefrom, is respectfully requested.

II. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims 1-47 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Mark D. Saralino/

Mark D. Saralino
Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: April 6, 2007

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113